

QUESTION VII

THE SIMPLICITY OF THE DIVINE ESSENCE

THERE are eleven points of inquiry: (1) Whether God is simple. (2) Whether God's substance or essence are the same as his being. (3) Is God in any genus? (4) Whether 'good,' 'just,' 'wise' and the like predicate an accident in God. (5) Whether the aforesaid terms signify the divine substance. (6) Whether these terms are synonymous. (7) Whether these terms are said of God and creatures univocally or equivocally. (8) Is there any relation between God and the creature? (9) Whether the relations between God and creatures are really in creatures. (10) Whether God is really related to the creature, so that the relation be something in God. (11) Whether temporal relations are in God only logically.

Q. VII: ARTICLE I

Is God Simple?

[Sum. Th. I, Q. iii]

THE first point of inquiry is whether God is simple: and seemingly he is not.

1. From one simple thing only one thing can naturally proceed: for the same always produces the same according to the Philosopher (De Gener. ii). But many things come from God. Therefore he is not simple.

2. If a simple thing is reached the whole of it is reached. Now God is reached by the blessed: for as Augustine says (De videndo Deum), "to reach God with the mind is great happiness." If, then, God is simple he is wholly reached by the blessed. Now that which is wholly reached is comprehended. Therefore God is comprehended by, the blessed: which is impossible. Therefore God is not simple.

3. The same thing cannot be several kinds of cause. Now God is several kinds of cause (Metaph. xi). Therefore there must be various things in him: and consequently he is composite.

4. Whatsoever contains one thing in addition to another is composite. Now in God there is one thing besides another, namely property and essence. Therefore there is composition in God.

5. It will be replied that the property is the same thing as the essence. On the contrary, affirmation and negation are not true of the same. Now the divine essence is common to the three Persons, whereas the properties are incommunicable. Therefore property and essence are not the same.

6. A thing is composite if different predicaments are predicated of it. Now substance and relation are predicated of God, according to Boethius (De Trin.). Therefore God is composite.

7. In everything there is substance, power and operation, according to Dionysius (Coel. Hier. xi): wherefore seemingly operation follows power and substance. Now there are several divine operations. Therefore there is plurality and composition in the divine substance.

8. Wherever there is plurality of forms there must be composition. Now in God there is plurality of forms, for as the Commentator says (Metaph. xi, com. 18), all forms exist actually in the first mover, even as they are potentially in primal matter. Therefore composition is in God.

9. Whatsoever is added to a thing that has complete being is accidental to it. Now certain things are said of God since the beginning of time, such as that he is the Creator and the Lord. Therefore these things are in him accidentally. But an

accident with its subject forms a kind of composition. Therefore composition is in God.

10. Where there are several things there is composition. Now in God there are three persons, and there are three things according to Augustine (*De Doct. Christ.* i, 5). Therefore composition is in God.

On the contrary, Hilary says (*De Trim.* viii): God is not composed of several things as man is, as though what he has were distinct from him who has it. Again Boethius says (*De Trin.*): He is truly one since there is no number in him. Now where there is composition there is number. Therefore God is incomposite and utterly simple.

I answer that we must hold that God is altogether simple and for the nonce this may be proved by three arguments. The first is as follows. We have proved (*Q. iii, A. 5*) in a former discussion, that all beings proceed from a first being which we call God. Now although in one and the same thing that is at one time in act, at another time in potentiality, potentiality precedes act in time but follows it in nature: yet absolutely speaking act precedes potentiality not only in nature, but also in time, since everything that is in potentiality is made actual by some being that is in act. Accordingly the being that made all things actual, and itself proceeds from no other being, must be the first actual being without any admixture of potentiality. For were it in any way in potentiality, there would be need of another previous being to make it actual. Now in every composite of whatsoever kind of composition there must needs be a mixture of act and potentiality: because of the things whereof it is composed, either one is in potentiality to the other, as matter to form, subject to accident, genus to difference, or all the parts together are in potentiality to the whole, since parts are reducible to matter, and the whole is reducible to form (*Phys.* ii) so that no composite is first act. But the first being which is God must needs be pure act, as we have proved (*Q. i, A. i*). Therefore it is impossible that God be composite: and thus it follows that he is utterly simple. The second reason is because seeing that composition requires difference in the component parts, these different parts require an agent to unite them together: since different things as such are not united. Now every composite has being through the union of its component parts. Therefore every composite depends on

a pre-existing agent: and consequently the first being which is God, from whom all things proceed, cannot be composite. The third reason is because the first being, which is God, must needs be most perfect and consequently supremely good: since the principles of things are not imperfect, as Pythagoras and Leucippus contended. Now the supremely good is that in which there is nothing lacking in goodness, even as the supremely white is that in which there is no admixture of blackness. But this is impossible in any composite thing because the good that results from the composition of its parts, and whereby the whole is good, is not in any single part. Wherefore the parts are not good with the goodness proper to the whole. Consequently that which is supremely good must be supremely simple and void of all composition. This argument is given by the Philosopher (Metaph. xi) and by Hilary (De Trin. vii), where he says that "God who is light is not composed of things that are dim, nor is he who is strength composed of things that are weak."

Reply to the First Objection. Aristotle does not mean that a multitude cannot proceed from one. For since an agent produces its like, and since an effect falls short of reproducing its cause, it follows that where we find unity in the cause we shall find multiplicity in the effects: thus in the sun's power all the forms of generable bodies are, in a fashion, one, and yet they are diversified in its effects. Hence it is that by its one power a thing is able to produce various effects: thus fire by its heat liquefies and solidifies, softens and hardens, flames and blackens: and man by the power of his reason acquires various sciences and produces various works of art. Wherefore a fortiori God by his one simple power is able to create many things. The Philosopher means then that a thing so long as it remains the same does not produce different effects at different times, if it act by natural necessity: except perhaps accidentally, through diversity of matter, or the intervention of another agent, but this is not to the point.

Reply to the Second Objection. God is attained by the mind of the blessed, whole but not wholly, because the mode of God's knowableness infinitely surpasses the mode of a created intellect: and thus the created intellect cannot understand God as perfectly as he is understandable, and consequently he cannot comprehend him.

Reply to the Third Objection. By reason of one and the same thing God is considered by us as having different kinds of causality: because in that he is the first act, he is an active cause, he is the exemplar of all forms, and he is supreme goodness and consequently the final cause of all things.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. Property and essence in God differ not in reality but only logically: for paternity itself is the divine essence, as we shall show further on (Q. viii, A. i).

Reply to the Fifth Objection. As the Philosopher says (Phys. iii, 3), nothing prevents contradictory statements being verified about one same thing from different points of view: thus the same identical point from different aspects is the beginning and end (of a line): and considered as the beginning it is not the end and vice versa. Wherefore since essence and property are the same in reality but differ logically, nothing prevents the one being common and the other incommunicable.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. In God the absolute and the relative do not differ really, but only logically as stated above: wherefore we cannot infer that there is composition in him.

Reply to the Seventh Objection. God's operation may be considered from the point of view either of the operator or of the work done. If we consider it on the part of the operator, then in God there is but one operation and this is in his essence: for he produces his effects not by an action that is between him and the thing done, but by his intelligence and will which are his very being. If, however, we consider God's operation on the part of the work done, then there are various operations, and various effects of the divine operation: but this does not argue composition in him.

Reply to the Eighth Objection. The form of the effect has a different mode of being in the natural agent and the agent by art. The form of the effect is in the natural agent inasmuch as the agent produces an effect of like nature, since every agent

produces its like. Now this happens in two ways. When the effect bears a perfect likeness to the agent, as proportionate to the agent's power, then the form of the effect is in the agent in the same degree: thus it is in univocal agents, for instance fire generates fire. When, however, the effect is not perfectly likened to the agent, as being improportionate to the agent's power, then the form of the effect is not in the same degree in the agent but in a higher degree: this is the case in equivocal agents, for instance the sun generates fire. On the other hand in agents by art, the form of the effect pre-exists in the same degree, but not in the same mode of being: because in the effect the form has material being, whereas in the mind of the craftsman it has intelligible being. Now whereas a thing may be in the intellect as the thing which we understand, and as the species whereby we understand, art-forms are in the intellect as that whereby we understand: because it is through conceiving the form of his art-work that the craftsman produces that work in matter. Accordingly the forms of things are in God in both ways. Because while his action in reference to things is from his intellect, it is not without the action of nature. But whereas here below the craftsman's art acts by virtue of an extraneous nature which it employs as an instrument, as a brickmaker uses fire to bake his bricks: on the other hand God's art employs no extraneous nature in its action, but produces its effect by virtue of his own nature. Hence the forms of things are in the divine nature as in the power that produces them, but not according to the same degree, since no effect is equal to that power. Consequently all forms that are manifold in his effects are in his power as one thing, so that their multiplicity argues no composition in him. Likewise in his intellect there are many things understood through one thing which is his essence. Now it is no proof of composition in one who understands that he understand many things by one: wherefore neither from this point of view does it follow that there is composition in God.

Reply to the Ninth Objection. Relations that are ascribed to God in time, are in him not really but only logically: because real relation is where one thing really depends on another either simply or in a certain respect. Hence knowledge bears a real relation to what is knowable, whereas the relation of the thing knowable to knowledge is only logical according to the Philosopher (Metaph. v, text. 20). Since then God depends on no other being, but on the contrary all things depend on him, other things bear a real relation to God, while his relation to them is only

logical, for the reason that our intelligence is unable to understand that A is related to B without conceiving a corresponding relation of B to A.

Reply to the Tenth Objection. Plurality of Persons does not argue composition in God. The Persons may be considered in two ways. First, in reference to the Essence with which they are identical: so that there is no composition here. Secondly, in reference to one another, and thus they are regarded as mutually distinct not as united together: wherefore from this point of view again there is no composition: since every composition implies union.

Q. VII: ARTICLE II

Is God's Essence Or Substance the Same As His Existence?

[Sum. Th. I, Q. iii, AA. 3, 4]

THE second point of inquiry is whether God's essence or substance is the same as his existence: and seemingly it is not.

1. Damascene says (De Fid. Orth. i, 1, 3): "That God is, is evident to us; but what he is in substance and nature is utterly incomprehensible and unknown." Now the same thing cannot be both known and unknown. Therefore God's existence is not the same as his substance or essence.

2. But it will be replied that God's existence is unknown to us even as his substance, as regards what it is.

On the contrary, these two questions are different, Is he? and What is he? and we know the answer to the former, but not the answer to the latter, as evinced from

the authority quoted. Therefore that which in God corresponds to the question Is he? is not the same as that which corresponds to the question What is he? and existence corresponds to the former question and substance or nature corresponds to the latter.

3. Again it will be replied that God's existence is known not in itself but through its likeness in creatures.

On the contrary, in the creature there is existence and substance or nature, and since it has both from God it is likened to God in both, because an agent produces its like. If then God's existence is known through the likeness of created existence, it follows that his substance is known through the likeness of created substance: and thus we would know not only that God is but also what he is.

4. A thing is said to differ from another by reason of its substance: nor can one thing differ from another by reason of that which is common to all things: wherefore the Philosopher says (Metaph. ii, 3) that being should not be placed in a definition, since it would not differentiate the thing defined from another. Consequently the substance of a thing that is distinct from other things cannot be its being, since being is common to all things. Now God is something distinct from all other things. Therefore his being is not his substance.

5. Things are not distinct if they have not a distinct being. Now the being of A is not distinct from B's being considered as being but considered as in this or that nature. Hence a being that is in a nature that is not distinct from its being will not be distinct from any other being: and thus it will follow, if God's substance is his being, that he is the common being of all things.

6. Being to which no addition can be made is being common to all things. Now if God is his own being no additions can be made to his being; and then his being will be common to all. Consequently he can be predicated of everything, and will enter into the composition of everything: which is heretical and contrary to the

statement of the Philosopher who says (De Causis, prop. xx) that the first cause rules all things without being mingled with them.

7. Nothing that implies concretion should be said of a thing that is utterly simple. Now such is existence: for it would seem that existence is to essence as whiteness is to the white thing. Therefore we should not say that God's substance is his existence.

8. Boethius says (De Hebdom.): Whatsoever has being participates of that which is being, and thus has being; and participates of something else, and thus it is this or that thing. Now God has being. Therefore, besides his being, there is something else in him whereby he is a particular thing.

9. That which is most imperfect should not be ascribed to God who is most perfect. Now existence is most imperfect like primal matter: for just as primal matter may be determined by any form, so being, inasmuch as it is most imperfect, may be determined by all the proper predicaments. Therefore as primal matter is not in God, so neither should existence be an attribute of the divine substance.

10. That which signifies something as an effect should not be ascribed to the first substance which has no beginning. Now such is existence, for every being has existence through its essential principles. Therefore it is unfitting to say that God's substance is its own existence.

11. A proposition is self-evident wherein a thing is predicated of itself. But if God's substance is its own existence, the subject and predicate will be identical in the proposition, God exists. Wherefore it will be a self-evident proposition; yet this is not true seemingly, since it can be demonstrated. Therefore God's existence is not his substance.

On the contrary, Hilary says (De Trin. vii): In God existence is not an accident but subsisting truth. Now that which is subsisting is the substance of a thing. Therefore God's existence is his substance.

Again, Rabbi Moses says that "God is a being but not in an essence, is living but not with life, is powerful but not with power, wise but not with wisdom." Therefore in God essence is not distinct from existence.

Again, a thing is properly denominated from what it is since the name of a thing denotes its essence and quiddity (Metaph. iv). Now of all God's names He who is (Exod. iv) is the most appropriate to him. Hence as this name, is given to him in respect of his existence, it would seem that God's very existence is his essence.

I answer that in God there is no distinction between existence and essence. In order to make this clear we must observe that when several causes producing various effects produce one effect in common in addition to their various effects, they must needs produce this common effect by virtue of some higher cause to which this effect properly belongs. The reason for this is that since a proper effect is produced by a particular cause in respect of its, proper nature or form, different causes having different natures and forms must needs have their respective different proper effects: so that if they have one effect in common, this is not the proper effect of any one of them, but of some higher cause by whose virtue they act: thus pepper, ginger and the like which differ in characteristics have the common effect of producing heat; yet each one has its peculiar effect differing from the effects of the others. Hence we must trace their common effect to a higher cause, namely fire to whom that effect properly belongs. Likewise in the heavenly movements each planet has its peculiar movement, and besides this they have all a common movement which must be the proper movement of some higher sphere that causes them all to revolve with the daily movement. Now all created causes have one common effect which is being, although each one has its peculiar effect whereby they are differentiated: thus heat makes a thing to be hot, and a builder gives being to a house. Accordingly they have this in common that they cause being, but they differ in that fire causes fire, and a builder causes a house. There must therefore be some cause higher than all other by virtue of which they all cause being and whose

proper cause is being: and this cause is God, Now the proper effect of any cause proceeds therefrom in likeness to its nature. Therefore being must be the essence or nature of God. For this reason it is stated in De Causis (prop. ix) that none but a divine intelligence gives being, and that being is the first of all effects, and that nothing was created before it.

Reply to the First Objection. 'Being' and 'is' maybe taken in two ways (Metaph. x, 13, 14). Sometimes they signify the essence of a thing and the act of being, and sometimes they denote the truth of a proposition even in things that have no being: thus we say that blindness is because it is true that a man is blind. Accordingly when Damascene says that God's existence is evident to us, the existence of God is taken in the second sense and not the first. For in the first sense God's existence is the same as his essence, and as his essence is unknown so also is his existence. In the second sense we know that God is, because we conceive this proposition in our mind from his effects.

This suffices for the Replies to the Second and Third Objections.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. God's being which is his essence is not universal being, but being distinct from all other being: so that by his very being God is distinct from every other being.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. As stated in De Causis (prop. iv) God's being is individualised and distinct from every other being by the very fact that it is self-subsistent being, and is not something additional to a nature that is distinct from its being. Now every other being that is not subsistent must be individualised by the nature and essence that subsists in that being: and of such beings it is true that the being of A is distinct from the being of B by the fact that it is the being of another nature: even so if there were one heat existing of itself without matter or subject, by that very fact it would be distinct from every other heat, just as heats existing in a subject are not differentiated otherwise than by their subjects.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. Being to which no addition is made is universal being, though the possibility of addition thereto is not incompatible with the notion of universal being: whereas the divine being is being to which no addition can be made and this enters into the very notion of the divine being: wherefore the divine being is not universal being. Thus by adding the difference rational to animal in general we do not add anything to the notion of animal in general: and yet it is not incompatible with the idea of animal in general that an addition to it be possible: for this enters into the notion of irrational animal which is a species of animal.

Reply to the Seventh Objection. The mode of signification of the names we give things is consequent upon our mode of understanding: for names signify the concepts of our intellect (*Peri Herm. i*). Now our intellect understands, being according to the mode in which it finds it in things here below from which it gathers its knowledge, and wherein being is not subsistent but inherent. Now our reason tells us that there is a self-subsistent being: wherefore although the term being has a signification by way of concretion, yet our intellect in ascribing being to God soars above the mode of its signification, and ascribes to God the thing signified, but not the mode of signification.

Reply to the Eighth Objection. The saying of Boethius refers to things that have being by participation and not by their essence: since that which has being by its essence, if we stress the terms' should be described as being itself rather than as that which has being.

Reply to the Ninth Objection. Being, as we understand it here, signifies the highest perfection of all: and the proof is that act is always more perfect than potentiality. Now no signate form is understood to be in act unless it be supposed to have being. Thus we may take human nature or fiery nature as existing potentially in matter, or as existing in the power of an agent, or even as in the mind: but when it has being it becomes actually existent. Wherefore it is clear that being as we understand it here is the actuality of all acts, and therefore the perfection of all perfections. Nor may we think that being, in this sense, can have anything added to it that is more formal and determines it as act determines potentiality: because being in this latter sense is essentially distinct from that to which it is added and

whereby it is determined. But nothing that is outside the range of being can be added to being: for nothing is outside its range except non-being, which can be neither form nor matter. Hence being is not determined by something else as potentiality by act but rather as act by potentiality: since in defining a form we include its proper matter instead of the difference: thus we define a soul as the act of an organic physical body. Accordingly this being is distinct from that being inasmuch as it is the being of this or that nature. For this reason Dionysius says (Div. Nom. v) that though things having life excel those that merely have being, yet being excels life, since living things have not only life but also being.

Reply to the Tenth Objection'. The order of agents follows the order of ends, in that the last end corresponds to the first agent and in due proportion other ends to other agents in their order. Take, for example, the ruler of a state, the commander of the army and a private soldier: the ruler is clearly the first in the order of agents; at whose orders the commander goes forth to the war; and under him is the private soldier who engages in hand-to-hand combat at the orders of his commander. Now the end of the, private soldier is to overthrow his opponent, and this is directed yet further to the victory of the army, which is the end of the commander-in-chief; and this again is directed to the welfare of the state or kingdom, which is the end of the ruler or king. Accordingly being which is the proper effect and end of the operation of the first agent must occupy the position of last end. Now although the end is first in the intention, it is last in execution, and is the effect of other causes. Therefore created being, which is the proper effect corresponding to the first agent, is caused from other principles, and yet the first cause of being is the first principle of all.

Reply to the Eleventh Objection. A proposition may be self-evident in itself and yet not self-evident to this or that individual; when, to wit, the predicate belongs to the definition of the subject, which definition is unknown to him: thus if he knew not what is a whole, he would not know this proposition, A whole is greater than its part. The reason is that such propositions become known when their terms are known (Poster. Anal. i). Now this proposition, God is, is in itself self-evident, since the same idea is expressed in both subject and predicate: but with regard to us it is not self-evident, because we know not what God is: so that for us it needs to be proved, though not for those who see God in his essence.

Q. VII: ARTICLE III

Is God Contained in A Genus?

[Sum. Th. I, Q. iii, A. 5]

THE third point of inquiry is whether God is contained in a genus: and seemingly he is.

1. Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iii, 4): Substance in God denotes the common species of the three Persons like in species: hypostasis signifies an individual, for instance the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Peter or Paul. Thus God is compared to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as a species to individuals. Now wherever there is a species with individuals, there is a genus: since the species is composed of genus and difference. Therefore seemingly God is contained in a genus.

2. Things which are in no way different are identical. But God is not identical with other things: therefore in some way he is different from them. Now that which is different from something else differs therefrom by some difference. Therefore there is a difference in God, whereby he differs from other things. But it is not an accidental difference, since nothing in God is accidental, as Boethius says (De Trin.). And every substantial difference makes a division of a genus. Therefore God is contained in a genus. Things may be the same either in genus, or in species, or in individual (Topic. i, 6). Therefore things may also differ in these ways, since if one of two opposites admits of multiplicity, the other does so too. Therefore God is distinct from a creature either in individual only, or in number and species, in which case he will be in the same genus as the creature, and consequently will be contained in a genus: or he will differ from the creature in genus, and then he will be in another genus from the creature: because diversity results from numbers, so that difference of genus implies a number of genera. Therefore in any case God must be contained in a genus.

4. Anything to which the generic difference of substance applies belongs to the genus (of substance). Now the generic difference of substance is self-subsistence, which is most applicable to God. Therefore God is in the genus of substance.

5. Anything that can be defined must be in a genus. Now God can be defined, for he is said to be pure act. Therefore God is contained in a genus.

6. Whatsoever is predicated of another essentially and of other things besides, is compared to that thing either as its species or as its genus. Now all things predicated of God are predicated of him essentially, since all the predicaments when applied to God refer to his essence, as Boethius says (*De Trin.*). And it is clear that they are applicable not only to God but to other things besides. Therefore they are compared to God either as the species to the individual, or as the genus to its species, and in either case God must be contained in a genus.

7. A thing is measured by a measure of its own genus (*Metaph. x*). Now according to the Commentator (*ibid.*) God is the measure of all substances. Therefore God is in the same genus as other substances.

On the contrary whatsoever is contained in a genus contains something in addition to the genus, and therefore is composite. But God is utterly simple. Therefore he is not contained in a genus.

Moreover, whatsoever is contained in a genus can be defined, or else comprised under something that is defined. But this cannot apply to God since he is infinite. Therefore he is not in a genus.

I answer that God is not contained in a genus, and for the nonce this may be proved by three arguments. The first argument is that nothing is assigned to a genus by reason of its being but by reason of its quiddity; and this is clear from the

fact that the being of a thing is proper to that thing and distinct from the being of anything else: whereas the essence may be common. Hence the Philosopher (Metaph. ii, 3) says that being is not a genus. Now God is Being itself: wherefore he cannot be in a genus.

The second reason is that although matter is not a genus nor form a difference, nevertheless the notion of the genus is taken from the matter, and the notion of the difference from the form: for instance, in man the sensible nature whence he derives his animality is material in relation to his reason whence derives the difference of rationality. For an animal is that which has a sensitive nature, and a rational being is one that has reason. Hence in everything that is contained in a genus there must be composition of matter and form, or of act and potentiality: and this cannot be in God who is pure act as we have shown (A. 1). Therefore he cannot be in a genus. The third reason is that as God is simply perfect he contains the perfections of all genera: for this is what is meant by being simply perfect (Metaph. v). Now that which is contained in a genus is confined within the limits of that genus. Wherefore God cannot be in a genus: for in that case his essence would not be infinite nor absolutely perfect, but his essence and perfection would be confined within the limits of a definite genus.

Hence it is also evident that God is neither a species nor an individual, nor is there difference in him. Nor can he be defined, since every definition is taken from the genus and species. Wherefore neither can we demonstrate anything about him save from his effects, since the middle proposition of an a priori demonstration is a definition.

Reply to the First Objection. Damascene uses the word species metaphorically and not in the strict sense. God's name (i.e. God) is like a species in that it is predicated essentially of several distinct individuals: but it cannot be called a species strictly speaking, since a species is not identically the same in each individual but only logically: whereas the same identical divine essence is common to the three Persons: wherefore Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one God, but Peter, Paul and Mark are not one man.

Reply to the Second Objection. A distinction is to be noted between difference and diversity according to the Philosopher (Metaph. x). Diversity is absolute and is applied to things which are not the same: whereas difference is relative, since that which is different differs in a certain respect. Accordingly if we take the term different strictly, it is not true that things which are in no way different are the same: but if we take the term different in a broad sense it is true: and in this sense we grant that God differs from other things. It does not follow, however, that he differs by reason of a difference, but that he differs from other things by reason of his essence: for this must needs be the case in first principles and simple things. Thus man differs from a donkey by the difference of rationality: but rationality is not distinguished from a donkey by a still further difference (since thus there would be no end to the process), for it differs therefrom by itself.

Reply to the Third Objection. God is said to be diverse in genus from the creature, not as though he were contained in another genus, but because he is altogether outside a genus.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. According to Avicenna (Metaph. iii, 8) substance is not rightly defined as a self-subsistent being: for being cannot be the genus of a thing according to the Philosopher (Metaph. ii, 3), because nothing can be added to being that has not a share of being, and a difference should not be a part of the genus. If, however, substance can be defined notwithstanding that it is the most universal of genera, its definition will be a thing whose quiddity is competent to have being not in a subject. Hence the definition of substance cannot be applied to God, whose quiddity is not distinct from his being. Wherefore God is not contained in the genus of substance but is above all substance.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. God cannot be defined: because whatsoever is defined is comprehended by the intellect of him that defines it; and God is incomprehensible to the intellect. Hence it is not a definition of God when we say that he is pure act.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. It is essential to a genus that it be predicated univocally. Now nothing can be predicated univocally of God and the creature, as we shall prove further on (A. 7). Hence although things predicated of God are predicated of him substantially they are not predicated of him generically.

Reply to the Eighth Objection. Although God does not belong to the genus of substance as contained in a genus, as a species or an individual is contained in a genus: yet we may say that he is in the genus of substance by reduction as its principle, even as a point is in the genus of continuous quantity, and unity in the genus of number. In this way he is the measure of all substances, as unity is the measure of all numbers.

Q. VII: ARTICLE IV

Do 'Good,' 'Wise,' 'Just' and the Like Predicate An Accident in God?

[Sum. Th. I, Q. iii, A. 6: xiii, 6]

THE fourth point of inquiry is whether good, wise, just and the like predicate an accident in God: and it would appear that they do.

1. A predicate that signifies not the substance but something consequent upon the nature of a thing is an accidental predicate. Now Damascene (De Fide Orthod.) says that good, just and holy when said of God, are consequent to his nature and do not signify his essence. Therefore they predicate an accident in God.

2. But it was replied that Damascene is referring to the mode of signification of these terms.

On the contrary, a mode of signification that results from the generic nature must have a real foundation: since when the predicate of a proposition is a genus it denotes the substance of the subject, for it is an essential predication. Now the mode of signification of the terms in question is consequent upon the nature in respect of the genus: for they are in the genus of quality, which by its very nature bears a relation to the subject: for a quality is whereby we are disposed in this or that way (quales). Therefore this mode of signification must be based on a reality; in other words the things signified by these words are consequent upon the nature of the thing of which they are predicated and therefore accidents.

3. But it will be said that these terms are not predicated of God in reference to their genus, which is quality; because the expressions we apply to God are not to be taken in their strict sense.

On the contrary, the species is falsely predicated of that which is not included in the genus: thus if a thing is not an animal it is untrue to say that it is a man. If then the genus of the aforesaid, which is quality, is not predicated of God, these terms will be not only improperly but also falsely predicated of God: and consequently it will be untrue to say that God is just or holy: and this cannot be admitted. Therefore we must conclude that these terms are predicated of God accidentally.

4. According to the Philosopher (Phys. i, 2) that which really has being, namely substance, is never an accident: wherefore in like manner a per se accident is always an accident. Now justice, wisdom and the like are per se accidents. Therefore in God also they are accidents.

1 5. Whatsoever we find in created things is copied from God who is the exemplary form of all things. Now wisdom, justice and so on are accidents in creatures. Therefore they are accidents in God.

6. Wherever there is quantity and quality there is accident. Now in God, seemingly, there is quantity and quality: because in him there is likeness and equality: thus we

say that the Son is like and equal to the Father: and likeness is oneness in quality, and equality is oneness in quantity. Therefore there are accidents in God.

7. A thing is measured by the first of its genus. Now God is the measure not only of substances but also of all accidents, since he is the creator of both substance and accident. Therefore in God there is not only substance but also accidents.

8. If A can be understood apart from B, B is accidental to A. Thus Porphyry (Praedic. cap. de accidente) proves that things which are separable are accidents, since we can conceive a white crow, and a white Ethiopian. Now it is possible to conceive God apart from goodness, according to Boethius; (De Hebdom.). Therefore goodness denotes an accident in God, and for the same reason the others.

9. Two things should be considered in the meaning of a name, namely that from which it is taken and the thing to which it is given: and in both respects this term 'wisdom' would appear to denote an accident. For it is taken from the fact that it makes a man wise, which seemingly is the act of wisdom; while the thing to which it is given is a quality. Therefore in every respect this and similar terms signify an accident in the subject of which they are predicated: and therefore it is an accident in God.

On the contrary, Boethius says (De Trin.) that God, inasmuch as he is a simple form, cannot be a subject. Now every accident is in a subject. Therefore there can be no accident in God.

Moreover every accident is dependent on something else. But no such thing can be in God, since that which is dependent must have a cause: and God is the first cause and has no cause whatsoever. Therefore no accidents can be in God.

Again, Rabbi Moses says that in God suchlike terms do not signify tendencies in addition to his substance. Now every accident denotes a tendency in addition to the substance of its subject. Therefore these terms do not denote accidents in God.

Again, an accident is something that can be present or absent without the destruction of its subject. But this is impossible in God, since he is unchangeable, as proved by the Philosopher (*Phys.* viii, 5). Therefore accidents cannot be in God.

I answer that without any doubt whatever we must hold that there are no accidents in God. For our present purpose it will suffice to prove this by three arguments.

The first argument is that no nature, essence or form can receive the addition of something extraneous: although that which has a nature, form or essence can receive something extraneous thereto, thus humanity contains nothing but what belongs intrinsically to humanity. This is clear from the fact that if anything be added to or subtracted from definitions which indicate the essence of a thing, the species is changed, as is the case with numbers, as the Philosopher observes (*Metaph.* viii). Man, however, who has humanity, can have something else which is not contained in the notion of humanity, such as whiteness and the like which are not humanity but in the man. Now in every creature there is a distinction between the one who has a thing and the thing which he has. In composite creatures there is a twofold difference; since the supposite or individual has the nature of its species—thus a man has humanity—and also has being: for a man is neither humanity nor is he his own being. Wherefore a man can have an accident, but his humanity or his being cannot. In simple substances there is only one difference, that namely between essence and existence. Thus in the angels every supposite is his own nature, since the quiddity of a simple being is the simple being itself according to Avicenna (*Metaph.* v), but it is not its own being, so that the quiddity subsists in its own being. In these substances therefore there can be an intelligible but not a material accident. On the other hand in God there is no distinction between haver and the thing had, or between participator and the thing participated: indeed he is both his own nature and his own being, wherefore nothing in him can be adventitious or accidental. This argument is apparently indicated by Boethius (*De Hebdom.*) when he says: "That which has being can have

something in addition to its being: but that which is being, has nothing besides itself."

The second reason is that since an accident is extraneous to the essence of its subject, and things that are diverse are not united together save by some cause, it follows, if any accident accrue to God, that this is due to some cause. It cannot, however, be due to some extrinsic cause, since it would follow that this extrinsic cause acts on God, and is previous to him, even as the mover precedes that which is moved and the maker that which is made: for an accident is produced in a subject by an extrinsic cause acting on the subject in which the accident is produced. Again it cannot be due to an intrinsic cause as happens with per se accidents whose cause is in their subject. For a subject cannot both cause and receive an accident on the same count, since no power moves itself into action: wherefore it must receive the accident on one count, and cause it on another, and thus it will be composite: thus certain things receive an accident on account of their matter, and cause it on account of the nature of their form. Now we have shown (A. i) that God is not composite. Therefore no accident can possibly be in him.

The third argument is that accident is compared to subject as act to potentiality, since it is a kind of form thereof. Wherefore since God is pure act without any admixture of potentiality, he cannot be the subject of an accident.

Accordingly from the foregoing we conclude that in God there is not composition of matter and form or of any essential parts, nor of genus and difference, nor of subject and accidents: and that the aforesaid terms do not predicate an accident in God.

Reply to the First Objection. Damascene is speaking of these names not as to what they predicate of God, but as to the reason why we predicate them of him. For we take these terms on account of their signification from certain accidental forms that we observe in creatures. In fact from this it is his intention to show that the expressions employed by us in speaking of God do not signify his essence.

Reply to the Second Objection. Although quality is the genus of human goodness, wisdom and justice, it is not their genus if we take them as predicated of God, because quality as such is a being inasmuch as it qualifies the subject in which it is. But wisdom and justice are denominated not from this but rather from a certain perfection or act: wherefore such things are predicated of God by reason of their difference and not of their genus. Hence Augustine says (*De Trin.* v, i): As far as we can, let us conceive goodness that is not a quality, and greatness that is not a quantity.—Wherefore we cannot conclude that such things are consequent to God's nature.

Reply to the Third Objection. If good and just were predicated of God univocally, it would indeed follow that their predication is false if we do not predicate their genus of him: but as we shall show further on (A. 7) nothing is predicated univocally of God and the creature.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. The wisdom that is an accident is not in God: his is another wisdom not univocally so called: hence the argument does not prove.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. The exemplar is not always a perfect reproduction of the exemplar; so that sometimes the exemplar reproduces defectively and imperfectly that which is in the exemplar: especially is this the case in exemplars that are taken from God who is an exemplar surpassing all proportion of the creature.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. Likeness and equality are ascribed to God not as though there were quality and quantity in him, but because we ascribe to him certain things which imply quality and quantity in us: for instance, when we say that God is great, wise, and so forth.

Reply to the Seventh Objection. Accidents are not beings save in relation to substance as the first being: wherefore we infer that accidents are measured by some first thing that is not an accident, but a substance.

Reply to the Eighth Objection. If we understand a thing in its essence then it is true that anything which does not enter into that consideration is accidental: since given that we understand it in its essence, we must needs understand whatsoever pertains to its essence; thus if we understand what a man is, we must needs understand what is an animal. Here, however, we do not see God in his essence, but consider him in his effects. Wherefore nothing prevents us from considering him in his effect that is being, without considering him in his effect that is goodness; and this is what Boethius intends to say. Yet it must be observed that although we may understand God somewhat without understanding his goodness; we cannot understand God and understand that he is not good—thus we cannot understand man and understand that he is not an animal—for this would be to deny God's essence which is goodness. On the other hand the saints in heaven who see God in his essence, by seeing God see his goodness.

Reply to the Ninth Objection. The term wisdom in its application to God is true as regards that from which it is taken. It is not taken, however, from the fact that it makes a man wise, but from its being a habit perfecting the intellect. For knowledge as such is referred to the thing known, whereas as an accident it is referred to the knower: and the possession of wisdom is accidental to man but not to God.

Q. VII: ARTICLE V

Do These Terms Signify the Divine Essence?

[Sum. Th. I, Q. xiii, A. 12]

THE fifth point of inquiry is whether these terms signify the divine essence: and seemingly they do not.

1. Damascene says (De Fide Orthod. i, 4): We must not think that the terms we employ in speaking of God denote what he is in his substance: rather do they indicate what he is not, or some kind of relationship, or something to be excluded from him, or else such things as are consequent to his nature or action. Now the being that is predicated of a thing substantially denotes what that thing's substance is. Therefore these terms are not predicated of God substantially as indicating his essence.

2. No term that signifies the essence of a thing can truly be denied of that thing. For Dionysius says (Col. Hier. ii) that "negations about God are true, but affirmations are vague." Therefore these terms do not signify God's essence.

3. According to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iii) these expressions signify the outpouring of divine goodness into things. But God does not pour out his substance on things. Therefore such expressions do not signify the divine essence.

4. Origen says that God is called wise because he fills us with wisdom, Now this denotes not the divine essence but a divine effect. Therefore these terms do not signify the divine essence.

5. The first cause is denominated only from its first effect (De Causis, prop. xvi) which is the intelligence. Now when a cause is denominated from its effect, the predication connotes not the essence but the cause. Therefore expressions that are ascribed to God do not predicate his essence but his causality.

6. Words signify the concepts of the intellect, as the Philosopher says (Peri Herm. i). Now we are unable to understand the divine essence; since as Damascene says (De

Fide Orth. i, 4) we know not what he is but that he is. Therefore we cannot give him a name nor employ words to express his essence.

7. According to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv) all things participate of the divine goodness. But all do not participate of the divine essence which is only in the three Persons. Therefore God's goodness does not denote his essence.

8. We cannot know God except from his likeness in creatures: thus the Apostle says (Rom. i, 20) that the invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made. Now we name him according as we know him. Therefore we do not name him except from his likeness in creatures. But when we name a thing from its likeness to another, such a name is predicated of it not essentially but metaphorically: inasmuch, as it is said secondly of God and first of the thing whence the simile is taken: whereas that which signifies the essence of a thing is said of that thing first.

9. According to the Philosopher (Metaph. viii) that which signifies the essence, denotes that and nothing else. Wherefore if this word good signifies the divine essence, there will be nothing in the divine essence that is not signified thereby: even so there is nothing in the essence of man that is not signified by this word man. But this word good does not signify wisdom: so that wisdom will not be the divine essence, and for the same reason neither will the other terms. Therefore all these words cannot possibly signify the divine essence.

10. As quantity is the cause of equality, and quality the cause of likeness, so is essence the cause of identity. If then all these expressions signify God's essence, they would no longer indicate equality or likeness but rather identity between God and us: so that a creature might be identified with God from the fact that it imitates his wisdom, goodness and so forth: and this is absurd.

li. Nothing can be contrary to nature in God who is the source of all nature: nor does he anything contrary to nature according to the (ordinary) gloss on Romans

xi, 24: Contrary to nature thou wert grafted. Now it is contrary to nature that an accident be substance. Since then wisdom, justice and the like are per se accidents, they cannot be substance in God.

12. When we say that God is good, good is a complex term. But there would be no complexity if God's goodness were his very substance. Therefore seemingly good does not denote God's substance; and the same reason applies to all similar expressions.

13. Augustine says that God eludes every conception of our intelligence, so that it cannot grasp him. But this would not be so if these terms signified the divine essence, since God would correspond to a conception of our intellect. Therefore they do not signify the divine essence.

14. Dionysius says (Myst. Theol. i) that man is best united to God by realising that in knowing God he knows nothing about him. But this would not be so if these ideas and expressions of man's reflected God's very essence. Therefore the same conclusion follows as before.

On the contrary, Augustine says (De Trin. vii, 7): In God to be is to be mighty, or wise; such is his simplicity that whatsoever you may say of him is his essence.

Again, Boethius says (De Trin.) that under whatsoever predicament, except relation, we predicate things of God they all refer to his essence: thus although just apparently indicates a quality, it signifies his essence: the same applies to great and so forth.

Again all things that are ascribed to another by way of participation presuppose one to whom they are ascribed per se and essentially. Now these expressions are applied to creatures by way of participation. Since then they are reduced to God as

their first cause, it follows that they are said of God essentially, and thus it follows that they signify his essence.

I answer that some have maintained, and Rabbi Moses most emphatically, that these terms when predicated of God do not signify the divine essence. He says in effect that these expressions are to be taken in reference to God in two ways. First, as indicating a likeness of effect: and that God is said to be wise, not that wisdom is something in him, but because in his effects he acts like a wise man, namely by directing each one to its due end; again that he is said to be a living God inasmuch as he acts like a living being, in that he acts of himself. Secondly, by way of negation: so that when we say God lives we do not mean that life is something in him, but that God has not that mode of existence which is in things inanimate. Likewise when we say that God is an intelligent being, we do not mean that intelligence is really in him, but that he has not that mode of existence whereby dumb animals exist: and so on. In either case, however, this explanation is apparently insufficient and objectionable. The first, for two reasons. First, because according to this explanation there, would be no difference in saying God is wise, or God is angry or God is a fire: since he is said to be angry because he acts like an angry man by punishing; for angry men are wont to act thus. Also he is said to be a fire, because he acts like fire when he cleanses, and fire does this in his own way. Now this is contrary to the view taken by the saints and prophets in speaking of God: since certain things they affirm of him and deny others: for they assert that he is living, wise and the like, and deny that he is a body or subject to passions. But in the opinion we are discussing anything may be said or denied of God with equal reason. The second reason is that since, as our faith teaches and as he also grants, creatures have not' always existed, it follows that we could not say that God was wise or good before the existence of creatures. For it is evident that before creatures existed he did nothing as regards his effects, neither as good nor as wise. Now this is altogether contrary to sound faith: unless perhaps he meant to say that before the existence of creatures God would be called wise, not that he worked as being wise, but because he could do so: and then it would follow that wisdom denotes something in God and consequently is his essence, since whatsoever is in God is his essence. The second explanation appears likewise to be unsatisfactory: because there is not a specific term that does not exclude from God some mode of being that is unbecoming to him. For every specific term includes the difference whereby the opposite species is excluded: thus the term lion includes the

difference quadruped which differentiates a lion from a bird. Accordingly if predicates about God were employed merely for the purpose of exclusion, just as we say that God is living because, according to him (Rabbi Moses), God has not being in the same way as inanimate creatures: even so might we say that God is a lion because he has not the mode of being of a bird. Moreover the idea of negation is always based on an affirmation: as evinced by the fact that every negative proposition is proved by an affirmative: wherefore unless the human mind knew something positively about God, it would be unable to deny anything about him. And it would know nothing if nothing that it affirmed about God were positively verified about him. Hence following Dionysius (Div. Nom. xiii) we must hold that these terms signify the divine essence, albeit defectively and imperfectly: the proof of which is as follows.

Since every agent acts inasmuch as it is actual and consequently produces its like, the form of the thing produced must in some manner be in the agent: in different ways, however. When the effect is proportionate to the power of the agent, this form must be of the same kind in the maker and the thing made: for then maker and thing made are of the same species, and this is the case in all univocal causes: thus man begets a man, and fire generates fire. When, however, the effect is impropportionate to the power of the cause, the form is not of the same kind in both maker and thing made, but is in the agent in a more eminent way. Because according as the form is in the agent, the latter has the power to produce the effect: so that if the whole power of the agent is not reflected in the thing made, it follows that the form is in the maker in a more eminent way than in the thing made. This is the case in all equivocal agents, for instance when the sun generates fire. Now it is plain that no effect equals the power of the first agent which is God, else only one effect would proceed from his one power. But seeing that from his one power many and various effects proceed, it is evident that every effect of his falls short of the power of its cause. Consequently no form of a divine effect is in the effect in the same degree as in God: and yet they must needs be in him in a more eminent way. Wherefore all forms which in the various effects are distinct and different from one another are united in him as in one common power: even so all the forms produced by the power of the sun in this lower world are in the sun in respect of its one power, to which all things generated by the sun's action are assimilated as regards their forms. In like manner the perfections of creatures are assimilated to God in respect of his one simple essence. Since then our intellect

takes its knowledge from creatures, it is informed with the likenesses of perfections observed in creatures, namely of wisdom, power, goodness and so forth. Wherefore just as creatures by their perfections are somewhat, albeit deficiently, like God, even so our intellect is informed with the species of these perfections. Now whenever an intellect is by its intelligible form assimilated to a thing, that which it conceives and affirms in accordance with that intelligible species is true of that thing to which it is assimilated by its species: inasmuch as knowledge is assimilation of the mind to the thing known. Hence it follows that whatsoever the intellect informed with the species of these perfections conceives or asserts about God, truly exists in God who corresponds to each one of these species inasmuch as they are all like him. Now if such an intelligible species of our intellect were equal to God in its likeness to him, our intellect would comprehend him, and the intellect's conception would be a perfect definition of God, just as a walking animal biped is a perfect definition of a man. However, this species does not perfectly reflect the divine essence, as stated above, and therefore although these terms which our intellect attributes to God from such conceptions signify the divine essence, they do not signify it perfectly as it exists in itself, but as it is conceived by us.

Accordingly we conclude that each of these terms signifies the divine essence, not comprehensively but imperfectly. Wherefore this name He Who Is is most becoming to God, since it does not ascribe any particular form to God, but signifies being without any limitation. This is the meaning of Damascene (*De Fide Orthod.* i, 12) when he says that the name He Who Is denotes "a boundless sea of substance." This solution of the question is confirmed by the words of Dionysius (*Div. Nom.* i): Since all things are comprised in the Godhead simply and without limit, it is fitting that he should be praised and named on account of them all. Simply because the perfections which are in creatures by reason of various forms are ascribed to God in reference to his simple essence: without limit, because no perfection found in creatures is equal to the divine essence, so as to enable the mind under the head of that perfection to define God as he is in himself. A further confirmation may be found in *Metaph.* v, where it is stated that the simply perfect is that which contains the perfections of all genera: which words the Commentator expounds as referring to God.

Reply to the First Objection. Damascene means to say that these expressions do not signify what God is by defining and including his essence as it were: wherefore he goes on to say that this name He Who Is which denotes God's essence indefinitely is most becomingly ascribed to God.

Reply to the Second Objection. Although Dionysius says that there is truth in denying these expressions of God he does not say that there is untruth in affirming them, but that their signification is vague: because as regards the thing signified they are truly ascribed to God, since in a way it is in him, as we have shown. But as regards their mode of signification they can be denied of God, since each of these terms denotes a definite form, and in this way they are not ascribed to God as we have already stated. Wherefore absolutely speaking they can be denied of God, because they are not becoming to him in the way signified: since this mode is according to the way in which they are in our intellect, as already stated, whereas they are becoming to God in a more eminent way. For this reason the affirmation of them is described as vague as being not altogether fitting on account of the difference of mode. Hence, according to the teaching of Dionysius (*Myst. Theol.* i; *Coel. Hier.* ii; *Div. Nom.* ii, iii), these terms are applied to God in three ways. First, affirmatively: for instance, God is wise: since we must needs say this of God because in him there is a likeness to the wisdom that derives from him.—Nevertheless seeing that wisdom in God is not such as that which we understand and name, it can be truly denied, so that we may say: God is not wise.—Again, since wisdom is not denied of God as though he were lacking in wisdom, but because in him it transcends the wisdom indicated and name, we ought to say that God is super-wise. Accordingly Dionysius explains perfectly by these three ways of ascribing wisdom to God, how these expressions are to be applied to God.

Reply to the Third Objection. These expressions are said to denote the divine outpourings, because they are first employed to signify these outpourings as existing in creatures, while from the likeness thereof to God the human mind is led to ascribe the same expressions to God in a higher degree.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. The saying of Origen does not mean that when we say God is wise, the sense is that God is the cause of wisdom; but that as we have

explained from the wisdom which he causes our intellect is led to ascribe supereminent wisdom to God.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. When we say that God is intelligence, we name him after his effect. But a name that signifies the essence of his effect cannot be applied to him definitively in the same way as it signifies that essence. Wherefore this name, although it is applicable to him in a way, is not applicable as his name: since that which a name signifies is the definition. On the other hand it is applicable to the effect as its name.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. This argument proves that we cannot give God a name that defines or includes or equals his essence since we do not know to that extent what God is.

Reply to the Seventh Objection. just as all things participate in God's goodness not in identity but in likeness thereto so also do they participate in a likeness of God's being. But there is a difference: for goodness implies the relationship of cause, since good is self-diffusive: whereas being connotes mere existence and quiescence.

Reply to the Eighth Objection. An effect includes something whereby it is like its cause, and something whereby it differs therefrom: and this by reason of its matter or something of the kind. Take for example a brick hardened by fire: the clay is heated by the fire and thus becomes like the fire: then it is condensed and hardened, and this is due to the nature of the material. Accordingly if we ascribe to the fire that wherein the brick is likened to it, it will be ascribed to it properly in a more eminent degree and with priority: because fire is hotter than the brick: and it is hot in a more eminent way, since the brick is hot by being made hot, while the fire is hot by nature. On the other hand if we ascribe to the fire that wherein the brick differs from the fire, it will be untrue, and any term that signifies this condition of dissimilarity cannot be said of fire unless metaphorically. Thus it is false to say that fire, the most subtle of bodies, is dense. It can, however, be described as hard on account of the violence of its action, and the difficulty to quench it. Accordingly

in creatures there are certain perfections whereby they are likened to God, and which as regards the thing signified do not denote any imperfection, such as being, life, understanding and so forth: and these are ascribed to God properly, in fact they are ascribed to him first and in a more eminent way than to creatures. And there are in creatures certain perfections wherein they differ from God, and which the creature owes to its being made from nothing, such as potentiality, privation, movement and the like. These are falsely ascribed to God: and whatsoever terms imply suchlike conditions cannot be ascribed to God otherwise than metaphorically, for instance lion, stone and so on, inasmuch as matter is included in their definition. They are, however, ascribed to him metaphorically by reason of a likeness in their effects.

Reply to the Ninth Objection. This argument considers that which signifies substance definitively and comprehensively: but none of these expressions denote the divine essence thus, as stated above.

Reply to the Tenth Objection. Although these perfections; in God are his very substance, they are not the very substance of the creature, wherefore in their respect the creature is not said to be the same as God but like him.

Reply to the Eleventh Objection. It would be contrary to nature if wisdom in God were of the same kind as that which is an accident: but this is not the case as we have already stated. Nor is the authority quoted to the point: for God makes nothing against nature in himself, because he makes nothing in himself.

Reply to the Twelfth Objection. When we say God is good, this term good is complex not as reflecting any composition in God, but on account of the composition in our intellect.

Reply to the Thirteenth Objection. God eludes the conception of our intellect because he transcends all that our mind conceives of him; but not so that our intellect is in no intelligible way likened to him.

Reply to the Fourteenth Objection. It is because human intelligence is not equal to the divine essence that this same divine essence surpasses our intelligence and is unknown to us: wherefore man reaches the highest point of his knowledge about God when he knows that he knows him not, inasmuch as he knows that that which is God transcends whatsoever he conceives of him.

Q. VII: ARTICLE VI

Are These Terms Synonymous?

[Sum. Th. I, Q. xiii, A. 4: C.G. I, 35]

THE sixth point of inquiry is whether these terms are synonymous: and apparently they are.

1. Synonyms are terms that have exactly the same meaning. Now all these terms when applied to God signify the same thing: for they denote the divine essence, which is altogether simple and one, as we have proved. Therefore, these terms are all synonymous.

2. Damascene says (De Fide Orth. i. ii) that in God A things are one except ingenerability, generation and procession. Now terms that signify the same are synonymous. Therefore all the terms applied to God, except those that signify personal properties are synonyms.

3. Things that are identical with one and the same thing are identical with one another. Now in God wisdom is identical with his substance, and so also are his will and his power. Wherefore in God wisdom, power and will are absolutely the same thing: and thus these terms are synonymous.

4. It will be replied that these terms signify one thing indeed, but from different points of view, and therefore are not synonyms.—On the contrary a point of view that has no objective reality is untrue and futile: so that if there are many such points of view, while the thing itself is only one, it would seem that these points of view are futile and false.

5. But someone will reply that these points of view are not futile, since something in God corresponds to them.—On the contrary creatures are likened to God inasmuch as they were made by him in likeness to his idea. Now plurality of ideas or points of view does not connote a plurality of relations in God to the creature: since by his essence he is the idea of all things. Neither then does anything in the divine essence correspond to the points of view from which we describe God from his likeness to his creatures.

6. That which is supremely one cannot be the root and foundation of multitude. Now the divine essence is supremely one. Therefore it cannot be the root and foundation of the different points of view of these expressions.

7. Difference of relations that are really in God, causes a distinction of Persons. If then something in God corresponds to the mutual relations of the attributes there would be a number of persons corresponding to the number of attributes: and thus there would be more than three persons in God which is heretical. Wherefore seemingly these expressions are altogether synonymous.

On the contrary it is futile to put words together that are synonymous, for instance, clothes and garments. If then these words are synonymous it will be futile to say God is good, God is wise: but this is not so.

Again, to deny one synonym about anything is to deny the others. Yet some have denied God's power without denying his knowledge or goodness. Therefore these words are not synonymous.

Again, this is proved from the Commentator who says (Metaph. xi) that these expressions when applied to God are not synonymous.

I answer that all those who have considered the question are agreed in saying that these terms are not synonymous. This view offers no difficulty to those who held that these expressions signify not God's essence, but certain notions added to his essence, or modes of the divine action in its effects, or the denial of what they signify in creatures. But given that they signify the divine essence, as we have proved (A. 5), the question would seem to present considerable difficulty: since then we have all these terms with one simple signification, namely the divine essence. But it must be observed that the signification of a term does not refer to the thing immediately but through the medium of the mind: because words are the tokens of the soul's impressions, and the conceptions of the mind. are images of things, according to the Philosopher (Peri Herm. i).

Now terms may be hindered from being synonymous either by reason of the things signified, or on the part of the notion conveyed by the term and to signify which the term is employed. Wherefore the terms which are applied to God cannot be hindered from being synonymous by reason of their signifying different things, according to what has been said above, but only by the various aspects consequent to the conception of the mind. Hence the Commentator (Metaph. xi) says that multiplicity in God is, only according to differences in the intellect and not in being, and we express the same when we say that he is one in reality and many things logically. Now these various aspects which are in our mind cannot be such that nothing corresponds to them on the part of the thing:~ since the things which these aspects regard are ascribed to God by the mind. Wherefore if there were nothing in God, either in himself or in his effect, corresponding to these points of view, the intellect would be in error in attributing them to him, and all propositions expressive of such attributions would be false; which is inadmissible. Now there are certain aspects to which nothing corresponds in the thing understood: but the things thus conceived the mind does not attribute to things as they are in themselves, but only as they are understood: for example, the aspect of genus or species and other intellectual 'intentions'; since in the things themselves that are

outside the mind there is nothing that is a likeness of the notion of genus or species. And yet the intellect is not in error: for the things reflected by these notions, namely genus and species, are not attributed by the intellect to things as existing outside the mind but only as existing therein. Because just as the intellect understands things existing outside the mind, so does it, by reflecting on itself, understand that it understands them: wherefore just as the intellect has a conception or notion to which the thing as existing outside the mind corresponds, so has it a conception or notion to which the thing corresponds as understood: for instance, to the notion or conception of a man there corresponds the thing outside the mind, while nothing but the thing as understood corresponds to the notion or conception of the genus or species. But it is impossible that such be the meaning of these expressions that are applied to God: for in that case the intellect would not attribute them to him as he is in himself but as he is understood: and this is plainly false; for when we say God is good, the sense would be that we think him to be so, but that he is not so in reality.

Accordingly some hold that the meanings of these terms connote various corresponding divine effects: for they maintain that when we say God is good, we indicate God's essence together with a connoted effect, the sense being God is and causes goodness, so that the difference in these attributions arises from the difference in his effects. But this does not seem right: because seeing that an effect proceeds in likeness to its cause, we must needs understand a cause to be such before its effects are such. Wherefore God is not called wise because he is the cause of wisdom: but because he is wise, therefore does he cause wisdom. Hence Augustine says (*De Doct. Christ.* ii, 32) that because God is good, therefore we exist, and inasmuch as we exist we are good. Moreover according to this view it would follow that these expressions are attributed to the creature before the Creator: just as health is attributed first to a healthy man and afterwards to that which gives health, since the latter is called healthy through being a cause of health.—Again if when we say God is good we mean nothing more than God is and is the cause of goodness, it would follow that we could equally predicate of him the names of all the divine effects, for instance, that God is heaven since he is the cause of heaven.—Again this is clearly false if it refer to actual causality: because then we could not say that God was good, wise or the like from eternity, for he did not cause things actually from eternity. If on the other hand it refer to virtual causality, so that God be called good because he is and has the power to infuse goodness; then we shall

have to say that the term good signifies that power. Now that power is a supereminent likeness of its effect even as the power of any equivocal agent. Thus it would follow that the intellect in conceiving goodness is like that which is in God and is God: so that something that is in God and that is God corresponds to the notion or conception of goodness.

We must say then that all these many and diverse notions correspond to something in God of which they are likenesses. For it is plain that one form can have but one specific likeness proportionate to it: while there can be many imperfect likenesses, each one of which falls short of a perfect representation of the form. Since then, as we have proved above, the ideas we conceive of the perfections; we observe in creatures are imperfect and impropportionate likenesses of the divine essence, nothing prevents the same one essence from corresponding to all these ideas, as being imperfectly represented thereby. So that all these conceptions are in the mind as their subject, but in God, as the foundation of their truth. For the idea that the intellect has of a thing is not true unless that thing corresponds to the idea by its likeness to it. Accordingly the cause of difference or multiplicity in these expressions is on the part of the intellect, which is unable to compass the vision of that divine essence in itself, but sees it through many faulty likenesses thereof which are reflected by creatures as by a mirror. Whereof if it saw that very essence, it would not need to use many terms, nor would it need many conceptions.

'For this reason God's Word, which is his perfect concept, is but one: wherefore it is written (Zach. xiv, 9): In that day there shall be one Lord, and his name will be one —when God's very essence will be seen, and knowledge of God will not be gathered from creatures.

Reply to the First Objection. These terms signify one thing indeed, but under different aspects, as stated above: hence they are not synonyms

Reply to the Second Objection. Damascene means that in God all things are one in reality except the personal properties which constitute a real distinction of Persons: but he does not deny a logical difference in the terms that are attributed to God.

The Reply to the Third Objection is clear from what has just been said: because as wisdom and goodness are in reality the same as the divine essence, so are they identical with each other: and yet they differ logically, as stated.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. It has already been explained that though God is absolutely one, yet these many concepts or notions are not false, because to all of them one and the same thing corresponds albeit imperfectly represented by them: but they would be false if nothing corresponded to them.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. Since in God there is absolute unity, and multiplicity in creatures, just as God understands many creatures by one intelligible species which is his essence, while there is a manifold relationship of God to creatures: even so in our intellect which mounts up to God from the multiplicity of creatures, there must be many species having relations to one God.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. These different aspects are founded on the divine essence not as their subject but as on the source of truth, or as on that which is represented by all of them: and this is not in conflict with God's simplicity.

Reply to the Seventh Objection. Paternity and Sonship are mutually opposed: so that they require a real distinction of supposites: whereas goodness and wisdom are not opposite to each other.

Q. VII: ARTICLE VII

Are These Terms Ascribed Univocally Or Equivocally to God and the Creature?

[Sum. Th. I, Q. xiii, A. 5: C.G. I, xxxii seqq.]

THE seventh point of inquiry is whether these terms are attributed to God and creatures univocally or equivocally.

1. Measure and the thing measured must be in the same genus. Now God's goodness is the measure of all created goodness, and the same applies to his wisdom. Therefore they are said of creatures univocally.

2. Things are like which have a common form. Now the creature can be likened to God, according to Genesis i, 26, Let us make man to our own image and likeness. Therefore there is a community of form between God and the creature. Now something can be predicated univocally of things that have a common form. Therefore something can be predicated univocally of God and the creature.

3. More or less makes no difference in the species. Now whereas God is called good and the creature also is called good, the difference seems to be that God is better than the creature. Therefore goodness in God and the creature is of the same species and consequently is predicated univocally of both.

4. There is no comparison possible between things of different genera, as the Philosopher proves (Phys. vii), thus we cannot compare the speed of alteration with the speed of local movement. But we compare God to the creature: thus we say that God is supremely good, and that the creature is good. Therefore God, and the creature are in the same genus and consequently something can be predicated of them univocally.

5. Nothing can be known except through a homogeneous species: thus whiteness in a wall would not be known by its image in the eye unless the two were homogeneous. Now God by his goodness knows all beings, and so forth. Therefore

God's goodness and the creature's are homogeneous: and consequently good is predicated univocally of God and the creature.

6. The house that the builder has in his mind and the material house are homogeneous. Now all creatures came from God as a work proceeds from the craftsman. Therefore goodness that is in God is homogeneous with the goodness that is in the creature: wherefore we come to the same conclusion as before.

7. Every equivocal agent is reduced to something univocal. Therefore the first agent which is God must be univocal. Now something is predicated univocally of a univocal agent and its proper effect. Therefore something is predicated univocally of God and the creature.

1. On the contrary the Philosopher says (Metaph. x, 7) that nothing except in name is common to the eternal and the temporal. Now God is eternal and creatures temporal. Therefore nothing but a name can be common to God and creatures: and consequently these terms are predicated equivocally of God and the creature.

2. Since the genus is the first part of a definition, a difference of genus causes equivocation: so that if a term be employed to signify something in different genera it will be equivocal. Now wisdom as attributed to a creature is in the genus of quality: wherefore seeing that it is not a quality in God, as we have shown, it would seem that this word wisdom is predicated equivocally of God and his creatures.

3. Nothing can be predicated except equivocally of things that are in no way alike. Now there is no likeness between creatures and God: for it is written (Isa. xl, 18): To whom then have you likened God? Therefore seemingly nothing can be predicated univocally of God and creatures.

4. But it will be replied that although God cannot be said to be like a creature, a creature can be said to be like God.

On the contrary, it is written (Ps. lxxxii, 2): O God, who shall be like to thee? as if to say: None .

5. A thing cannot be like a substance in respect of an accident. Now wisdom in a creature is an accident, and in God is the substance. Therefore man cannot be like God by his wisdom.

6. Since in a creature being is distinct from form or nature, nothing can be like being itself by its form or nature. Now these terms when predicated of a creature signify a form or nature: while God is his own very being. Therefore a creature cannot be like God by these things that are predicated of a creature: and thus the same conclusion follows as before.

7. God differs more from a creature than number from whiteness. But it is absurd to liken a number to whiteness or vice versa. Therefore still more absurd is it to liken a creature to God: and again the same conclusion follows.

8. Things that are like have some one thing in common: and things that have one thing in common have a common predicate. But nothing whatever can be predicated in common with God. Therefore there can be no likeness between God and the creature.

I answer that it is impossible for anything to be predicated univocally of God and a creature: this is made plain as follows. Every effect of an univocal agent is adequate to the agent's power: and no creature, being finite, can be adequate to the power of the first agent which is infinite. Wherefore it is impossible for a creature to receive a likeness to God univocally. Again it is clear that although the form in the agent and the form in the effect have a common ratio, the fact that they have

different modes of existence precludes their univocal predication: thus though the material house is of the same type as the house in the mind of the builder, since the one is the type of the other; nevertheless house cannot be univocally predicated of both, because the form of the material house has its being in matter, whereas in the builder's mind it has immaterial being. Hence granted the impossibility that goodness in God and in the creature be of the same kind, nevertheless good would not be predicated of God univocally: since that which in God is immaterial and simple, is in the creature material and manifold. Moreover being is not predicated univocally of substance and accident, because substance is a being as subsisting in itself, while accident is that whose being is to be in something else. Wherefore it is evident that a different relation to being precludes an univocal predication of being. Now God's relation to being is different from that of any creature's: for he is his own being, which cannot be said of any creature. Hence in no way can it be predicated univocally of God and a creature, and consequently neither can any of the other predicables among which is included even the first, being: for if there be diversity in the first, there must be diversity in the others: wherefore nothing is predicated univocally of substance and accident.

Others, however, took a different view, and held that nothing is predicated of God and a creature by analogy but by pure equivocation. This is the opinion of Rabbi Moses, as appears from his writings. This opinion, however, is false, because in all purely equivocal terms which the Philosopher calls equivocal by chance, a term is predicated of a thing without any respect to something else: whereas all things predicated of God and creatures are predicated of God with a certain respect to creatures or vice versa, and this is clearly admitted in all the aforesaid explanations of the divine names. Wherefore they cannot be pure equivocations. Again, since all our knowledge of God is taken from creatures, if the agreement were purely nominal, we should know nothing about God except empty expressions to which nothing corresponds in reality. Moreover, it would follow that all the proofs advanced about God by philosophers are sophisms: for instance, if one were to argue that whatsoever is in potentiality is reduced to actuality by something actual and that therefore God is actual being, since all things are brought into being by him, there will be a fallacy of equivocation; and similarly in all other arguments. And again the effect must in some way be like its cause, wherefore nothing is predicated equivocally of cause and effect; for instance, health of medicine and an animal.

We must accordingly take a different view and hold that nothing is predicated univocally of God and the creature: but that those things which are attributed to them in common are predicated not equivocally but analogically. Now this kind of predication is twofold. The first is when one thing is predicated of two with respect to a third: thus being is predicated of quantity and quality with respect to substance. The other is when a thing is predicated of two by reason of a relationship between these two: thus being is predicated of substance and quantity. In the first kind of predication the two things must be preceded by something to which each of them bears some relation: thus substance has a respect to quantity and quality: whereas in the second kind of predication this is not necessary, but one of the two must precede the other. Wherefore since nothing precedes God, but he precedes the creature, the second kind of analogical predication is applicable to him but not the first.

Reply to the First Objection. This argument avails in the case of a measure to which the thing measured can be equal or commensurate: but God is not a measure of this kind 3ince he infinitely surpasses all that is measured by him.

Reply to the Second Objection. The likeness of the creature to God falls short of univocal. likeness in two respects. First it does not arise from the participation of one form, as two hot things are like by participation of one heat: because what is affirmed, of God and creatures is predicated of him essentially, but of creatures, by participation: so that a creature's likeness to God is as that of a hot thing to heat, not of a hot thing to one that is hotter. Secondly, because this very form of which the creature participates falls short of the nature of the thing which is God just as the heat of fire falls short of the nature of the sun's power whereby it produces heat.

Reply to the Third Objection. More and less may be considered from three points of view, and predicated accordingly. First when it is only a question of the quantity of the thing participated: thus snow is said to be whiter than the wall, because whiteness is more perfect in the snow than in the wall, and yet it is of the same

nature: and consequently such a difference of more or less does not cause a difference of species. Secondly when the one is predicated participatively and the other essentially: thus we might say that goodness is better than a good thing. Thirdly when the one same term is ascribed to one thing in a more eminent degree than to another, for instance, heat to the sun than to fire. These last two modes of more and less are incompatible with unity of species and univocal predication: and it is thus that a thing is predicated more and less of God and creatures, as already explained.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. When we say that God is better or that he is the sovereign good we compare him to creatures not as though he participated of the same generic, nature as creatures, like the species of a genus; but as the principle of a genus.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. Inasmuch as an intelligible species has a higher mode of existence, the knowledge arising therefrom is the more perfect: for instance, the knowledge arising from the image of a stone in the mind is more perfect than that which results from the species in the senses. Hence God is able to know things most perfectly in his essence, inasmuch as in his essence is the supereminent but not homogeneous likeness of things.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. There is a twofold likeness between God and creatures. One is the likeness of the creature to the divine mind, and thus the form understood by God and the thing itself are homogeneous, although they have not the same mode of being, since the form understood is only in the mind, while the form of the creature is in the thing. There is another likeness inasmuch as the divine essence itself is the supereminent but not homogeneous likeness of all things. It is by reason of this latter likeness that good and the like are predicated in common of God and creatures: but not by reason of the former, because when we say God is good we do not mean to define him from the fact that he understands the creature's goodness, since it has already been observed that not even the house in the mind of the builder is called a house in the same sense as the house in being.

Reply to the Seventh Objection. The equivocal agent must precede the univocal: because the latter's causality does not extend to the whole species (else it were its own cause) but only to an individual member of the species. But the equivocal agent's causality extends to the entire species: and consequently the first agent must be an equivocal agent.

1. Reply to the First Argument on the contrary side. The Philosopher refers to things that are common physically, not logically. Now things that have a different mode of existence have nothing in common in respect of that being which is considered by the physicist, but they may have some common 'intention' that the logician may consider. Moreover, even from the physicist's point of view the elemental and the heavenly body are not in the same genus: but in the view of the logician they are. However, the Philosopher does not mean to exclude analogical but only univocal community: since he wishes to prove that the corruptible and the incorruptible have not a common genus.

2. Difference of genus excludes univocation but not analogy. In proof of this, healthy is applied to urine in the genus of sign, but to medicine in the genus of cause.

3. In no sense is God said to be like the creature, but contrariwise: for as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. x), "likeness is not reciprocated between cause and effect, but only in coordinates": thus a man is not said to be like his statue, but vice versa, the reason being that the form wherein the likeness consists is in the man before it is in the statue. Hence we do not say that God is like his creatures but vice versa.

4. According to Dionysius (ibid.) when it is said that no creature is like God this is to be understood as referring to effects which are imperfect and beyond all comparison fall short of their cause: nor does this refer to the quantity of the thing participated but to the other two modes, as explained above (Reply to Third Objection).

5. A thing cannot be like substance in respect of an accident, so that the likeness regard a form of the same kind: but there may be the likeness that is between cause and effect: since the first substance must needs be the cause of all accidents.

6. The Sixth Argument is answered in like manner.

7. Whiteness is not in the genus of number, nor is it the principle of a genus: wherefore they do not admit of comparison. Whereas God is the principle of every genus, and consequently all things are somewhat likened to him.

8. This argument refers to things that have a common genus or matter: which does not apply to God and the creature.

Q. VII: ARTICLE VIII

Is There Any Relation Between God and the Creature?

[Sum. Th. I, Q. xiii, A. 7: Q. xxviii, A. 4: Q. xxxii, A. 2]

THE eighth point of inquiry is whether there be any relation between God and the creature: and it would seem that there is none.

1. According to the Philosopher (De Praedic. v) relatives are simultaneous. But creatures cannot be simultaneous with God: since in every way he precedes creatures Therefore there cannot be any relation between God and a creature.

2. Things that are related can be compared in some way. But there is no comparison between God and a creature: since things that differ in genus are not

comparable with one another, for instance, a number and a line. Therefore there is no relation between God and a creature.

3. Relative and co-relative. belong to the same genus. But God is not in the same genus as the creature. Therefore we cannot predicate a relation between them.

4. A creature cannot be in opposition to the Creator: because one opposite is not the cause of the other. Now relatives are in opposition to each other. Therefore there cannot be a relation between a creature and God.

5. Anything of which something new can be predicated, may be said in a sense to become. Consequently if something be said of God in relation to the creature, it follows that in a sense God becomes: which is impossible, seeing that he is unchangeable.

6. Whatsoever is predicated of a thing is predicated either essentially or accidentally. Now expressions that denote relation to creatures are not predicated of God essentially, since essential predicates are predicated necessarily and always: nor are they predicated accidentally. Therefore such relations can nowise be predicated of God.

On the contrary Augustine says (De Trin. v., 13) that the Creator is related to the creature as the master to his servant.

I answer that relation differs from quantity and quality in that quantity and quality are accidents residing in the subject, whereas relation, as Boethius says (De Trin.), signifies something not as adhering to a subject but as passing from it to something else: wherefore de la Porrée said that relations are not adherent but assistant, which is true in a sense as we shall show further on. Now when a thing is attributed to someone as proceeding from him to another this does not argue composition between them, as neither does action imply composition with the

agent. And for this reason the Philosopher proves (Phys. v) that there can be no movement in relation: since without any change in the thing that is related to another, the relation can cease for the sole reason that this other is changed. Thus it is clear with regard to action that there is no movement in respect of action except metaphorically and improperly speaking, just as we say that one who passes from inaction into action is changed: and this, would not be the case if relation or action signified something abiding in the subject. Hence it is evident that it is not incompatible with a thing's simplicity to have many relations towards other things: indeed the more simple a thing is the greater the number of its concomitant relations: since its power is so much the less limited and consequently its causality so much the more extended. Wherefore it is stated in De Causis (prop. xvii) that a united force is less confined than a distributed force. Now we must needs admit a relation between a principle and the things which proceed from it; and not only a relation of origin inasmuch as a result springs from its source, but also a relation of distinction, seeing that an effect must needs be distinct from its cause, for nothing is its own cause. Accordingly from God's supreme simplicity there results an infinite number of respects or relations between creatures and him, inasmuch as he produced creatures distinct from himself and yet somewhat likened to him.

Reply to the First Objection. Those relatives are naturally simultaneous which have the same reason for their mutual relationship, for instance, father and son, master and servant, double and half. But when there is not the same reason on either side for referring one thing to another, then relatives are not naturally simultaneous, but one naturally precedes the other: as the Philosopher states with regard to sense and the sensible object, knowledge and the thing knowable (De Praed. v). Wherefore it clearly does not follow that God and the creature are naturally simultaneous, since there is not the same reason on either side for one being referred to the other. It is not necessary, however, even in relatives that are naturally simultaneous that the subjects be naturally simultaneous, but only the relations.

Reply to the Second Objection. Not all the things that are related can be compared to each other, but only those that are related in respect of one quantity or quality, so that one may be described as greater, better, whiter and so on than the other. But different relations can be compared to each other even if they belong to

different genera: since things that differ generically differ from one another. And yet although God is not in the same genus as the creature as a thing contained in a genus, he is nevertheless in every genus as the principle of the genus: and for this reason there can be relation between the creature and God as between effect and principle.

Reply to the Third Objection. The subjects of things mutually related need not be in the same genus, but only the things themselves that are thus related: thus quantity is said to be distinct from quiddity. And yet as we have already said it is not the same with God and creatures as with things differing generically and nowise co-ordinated to one another.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. Relative opposition differs in two ways from other kinds of opposition. First in the latter one thing is said to be opposite to another inasmuch as it excludes it,—as negation excludes affirmation,—and in this respect is opposed to it: and opposition of privation and habit, and of contrariety includes opposition of contradiction (Metaph. iv). But it is not thus with things that are opposed relatively. For son is not opposed to father by excluding him, but on account of the nature of his relationship to him. Hence follows the second difference: because in other kinds of opposition one of the opposites is always imperfect by reason of the negation attaching to privation and one of the contraries. But this is not necessarily so in relative opposition, indeed it is possible to consider both relatives as perfect, as is especially evident in equiparent relatives and in relatives of origin, for instance, things that are equal to or like one another, father and son. Wherefore relation is more attributable to God than other kinds of opposition. By reason of the first difference relative opposition may be observed between the creature and God, but not any other kind: seeing that it is owing to God that creatures are affirmed rather than excluded; and yet creatures have a certain relationship to God. By reason of the second difference, in the divine Persons (in whom there can be no imperfection) there can be relative opposition and no other, as we shall show further on (Q. viii).

Reply to the Fifth Objection. To become is to be changed properly speaking: wherefore just as a thing is not changed in respect of a relation except accidentally,

to wit through a change in the thing to which the relation is consequent, so neither is a thing said to become in respect of a relation, except accidentally. Thus a body through a change in its quantity becomes equal (to another), yet the change is not essentially connected with equality but is related thereto accidentally. And yet a thing does not need to be changed in order that a relation begin to be predicated of it but it suffices that a change occur in one of the extremes since the cause of relationship between two is something inherent in both. Consequently from whichever extreme a change is wrought in that which caused the relationship, the relationship between them ceases. Accordingly from the fact that a change is wrought in the creature, a relation begins 'to be attributed to God. Hence he cannot be said to become except metaphorically; inasmuch as he is like a thing that becomes, through something new that is said about him: thus we say (Ps. lxxxix, i) : Lord, thou art become our refuge.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. When these relations begin to be ascribed to God on account of some change wrought in creatures, it is evident that the cause of their being attributed to him is on the part of the creature, and that they are predicated of God accidentally. But as Augustine says this does not imply an accident in God, but refers to something outside him and compared to him accidentally: for God's existence does not depend on creatures as neither does the builder's existence depend on the house: wherefore just as it is accidental to the builder that the house exists, so is it accidental to God that the creature exists. For we say that anything without which a thing can exist is accidental to it.

Q. VII: ARTICLE IX

Are These Relations Between A Creature and God Really in Creatures Themselves?

THE ninth point of inquiry is whether these relations between creatures and God are in creatures themselves: and it would seem that they are not.

1. There are certain relations which posit nothing real on either side; as Avicenna says (Metaph. iv, 10) of the relation between entity and non-entity. Now no relatives are further apart than God and the creature. Therefore this relation posits nothing real on our side.

2. We must not assert anything that leads to an indefinite process. Now if relation to God is something real in a creature, we shall have to go on indefinitely: since that relation will be a creature, if it be something real, and therefore will likewise bear a relation to God, and so on indefinitely. Therefore we must not assert that relation to God is something real in a creature.

3. Nothing has a relation except to one definite thing (Metaph. iv): thus double is not related to anything but half; and father is not related except to son, and so on. Therefore there must be correspondence between the things that are related and those to which they are related. Now God is simply one being. Therefore there can be no real relation in creatures to him.

4. The creature is related to God inasmuch as it proceeds from him. Now the creature proceeds from God as to its very substance. Therefore it is related to God by its substance and not by an additional relation.

5. A relation is a kind of mean between the related extremes. But there can be no real mean between God and the creature which is created by him immediately. Therefore relation to God is nothing real in the creature.

6. The Philosopher (Metaph. iv) says that if the reality of things depended on our opinion and perception, whatsoever we perceive would be real. Now it is clear that all creatures are dependent on the perception or knowledge of their Creator. Therefore all creatures are referred to God by their substance and not by an inherent relation.

7. It would seem that the more things are distant from one another the less are they related. Now there is a greater distance between the creature and God than between one creature and another. But seemingly the relation between one creature and another is nothing real: for since it is not a substance, it must be an accident and consequently must be in a subject, and therefore cannot be removed therefrom without the subject being changed: and yet we have asserted the contrary to be the case with relations. Therefore the creature's relation to God is nothing real.

8. just as a created being is infinitely distant from nonbeing, so also is it infinitely distant from God. But there is no relation between created being and absolute non-being, according to Avicenna (Metaph. iv, 10). Neither therefore is there a relation between created being and uncreated being.

On the contrary Augustine says (De Trin. v, 16): It is evident that whatever begins to be Predicated of God whereas it was not Predicated of him before is said of him relatively: relatively, that is, not to an accident in God (as if something had accrued to him), but, without doubt, to an accident in the thing in relation to which God begins to be predicated. Now an accident is something real in its subject. Therefore relation to God is something in the creature.

Again, whatsoever is related to a thing through being changed is really related thereto. Now the creature is related to God through being changed. Therefore it is really related to God.

I answer that relation to God is something real in the creature. To make this clear we must observe that as the Commentator says (Metaph. xi, text. 19), seeing that of all the predicaments relation has the least stability, some have thought that it should be reckoned among the predicables because the predicaments (*prima intellecta*) have an objective reality and are the first things to be understood by the intellect: whereas the predicables (*secunda intellecta*) are certain 'intentions' consequent to our mode of understanding: inasmuch as by a second act the intellect reflects on itself, and knows both the fact that it understands and the

manner of its understanding. According then to this view it would follow that relation has no objective reality, but exists only in the mind, even as the notion of genus or species and of second substances. But this is impossible: because nothing is assigned to a predicament unless it has objective reality: since logical being is divided against the being that is divided by the ten predicaments (Metaph. v). Now if relation had no objective reality, it would not be placed among the predicaments. Moreover the perfection and goodness that are in things outside the mind are ascribed not only to something absolute and inherent to things but also to the order between one thing and another: thus the good of an army consists in the mutual ordering of its parts, to which good the Philosopher (Metaph. x) compares the good of the universe. Consequently there must be order in things themselves, and this order is a kind of relation. Wherefore there must be relations in things themselves, whereby one is ordered to another. Now one thing is ordered to another either as to quantity or as to active or passive power: for on these two counts alone can we find in a thing something whereby we compare it with another.

For a thing is measured not only by its intrinsic quantity but also in reference to an extrinsic quantity. And again by its active power one thing acts on another, and by its passive power is acted on by another: while by its substance and quality a thing is ordered to itself alone and not to another, except accidentally: namely inasmuch as a quality, substantial form or matter is a kind of active or passive power, and forasmuch as one may ascribe to them a certain kind of quantity: thus one thing produces the same in substance; and one thing produces its like in quality; and number or multitude causes dissimilarity and diversity in the same things; and dissimilarity in that one thing is considered as being more or less so and so than another, thus one thing is said to be whiter than another. Hence the Philosopher (Metaph. v) in giving the species of relations, says that some are based on quantity and some on action and passion. Accordingly things that are ordered to something must be really related to it, and this relation must be some real thing in them. Now all creatures are ordered to God both as to their beginning and as to their end: since the order of the parts of the universe to one another results from the order of the whole universe to God: even as the mutual order of the parts of an army is on account of the order of the whole army to its commander (Metaph. xii). Therefore creatures are really related to God, and this relation is something real in the creature.

Reply to the First Objection. That between one creature and another there is a relation which posits nothing in either extreme is not due to the distance between them, but to the fact that certain relations are based not on any order in things, but on an order which is only in our intellect: but this does not apply to the order of creatures to God.

Reply to the Second Objection. The relations themselves are not related to something else by any further relation but by themselves because their very essence is relative. It is not the same with things whose essence is absolute, so that this does not lead to an indefinite process.

Reply to the Third Objection. The Philosopher concludes (ibid.) that if all things are related to the supreme good, the supreme good must be infinite by nature: and accordingly an infinite number of things can be related to that which is infinite by nature. Such is God, since the perfection of his essence is not confined to any genus, as we have stated above. For this reason an infinite number of creatures can be related to God.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. The creature is related to God by its essence as cause of that relation, and by that same relation, formally: thus a thing is said to be like in quality, causally; and by its likeness, formally: and for this reason the creature is said to be like God.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. When it is said that the creature proceeds from God immediately, we exclude an intermediate creative cause, but not the intermediate real relationship which arises naturally from the creature's production, even as equality results immediately from quantity: thus a real relation follows naturally the production of created substance.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. Creatures depend on God's knowledge as an effect depends on its cause, and not as though their very existence consisted in that

knowledge, so that for a creature to exist would mean nothing else but that it is known by God. This was the view of those who contended that whatsoever is perceived is real, and that the reality of things depends on' our thoughts and perception, so that to exist would be nothing but to be an object of perception or thought.

Reply to the Seventh Objection. The very relation that is nothing but the order between one creature and another may be considered as an accident, or as a relation. Considered as an accident it is something adhering to a subject; but not considered as a relation or order, for then it is mere towardness, something passing as it were from one thing to another and assisting that which is related. Accordingly a relation is something inherent, but not because it is a relation: thus action as action is considered as issuing from the agent; but, as an accident, is considered as inherent to the active subject. Wherefore nothing prevents such an accident from ceasing to exist without 'any change in its subject, because it is not essentially complete through its existence in its subject but through transition into something else: and if this be removed the essence of this accident is removed as regards the action, but remains as regards its cause: even so, if the matter be removed, the heating is removed, although the cause of heating remain.

Reply to the Eighth Objection. There is no order between created being and non-being, but there is between created and uncreated being, hence the comparison fails.

Q. VII: ARTICLE X

Is God Really Related to the Creature So That this Relation Be Something in God?

THE tenth point of inquiry is whether God be really related to the creature so that this relation be something in God and seemingly the answer should be in the affirmative.

1. There is a real relation in the mover to that which it moves: wherefore the Philosopher (Metaph. v) reckons the relation between mover and moved to be a species of the predicament relation. Now God is compared to the creature as mover to that which is moved. Therefore he is really related to the creature.

2. It will be replied that he moves creatures without any change in himself; wherefore he is not really related to the thing moved. On the contrary, the presence of one of two relative opposites in a thing is not a reason for attributing the other to the same thing: thus a thing is not double because it is a half, nor is God Father because he is Son. Accordingly if mover and moved are mutually related, it does not follow that where there is the relation of mover there must be the relation of moved. Hence that God is not moved does not hinder him from having the relation of mover to moved.

3. As the father gives being to the son so does the Creator give being to the creature. But the father is really related to the son. Therefore the Creator is also really related to the creature.

4. Terms that are predicated of God properly and not metaphorically indicate the thing signified as being in God; and among terms of this kind Dionysius (Div. Nom. i) reckons Lord. Wherefore the thing signified by this word Lord is really in God. But it is a relation to the creature. Therefore, etc.

5. Knowledge relates to the thing knowable (Metaph. v). Now God is compared to creatures as known to the thing known. Therefore in God there is a relation to creatures.

6. The thing moved always bears a relation to its mover. Now the will is compared to the thing willed as the thing moved to its mover: because the appetible object is a mover that is not moved, (Metaph. x ii). Since then it is God's will that things exist, for he hath done all things whatsoever he would (Ps. cxiii, ii), it would seem that he is really related to the creature.

7. If God is not related to creatures, the only reason would seem to be that he is not dependent on them and is far above them. But the heavenly bodies likewise are independent of elemental bodies and surpass them almost out of all proportion. Wherefore it would follow that there is no real relation in the higher bodies to the lower world.

8. All names are taken from forms: and forms are something inherent to the things whereto they belong. Since then God is named from his relation to creatures, it would seem that these relations are something in God.

9. Proportion—for instance that of double to half—is a real relation. Now seemingly there is a proportion in God to the creature: since there must be proportion between mover and the thing moved. Therefore it would seem that God is really related to creatures.

10. Whereas understanding is an image of the thing (understood), and words are signs of things, according to the Philosopher (*Peri Herm.* i), these two are ordered differently in disciple and teacher. The teacher begins with the things whence he has gathered the knowledge in his intellect, and expresses that knowledge in words, while the disciple begins with the words through which he arrives at the ideas in the intellect of the teacher, and thence at the knowledge of things. Now whatsoever is said about these relations must first of all come to the knowledge of a teacher. Consequently with him these relative terms correspond to the ideas in his intellect and these ideas correspond to an objective reality: wherefore seemingly these relations are real.

11. These relative terms which are predicated of God in time signify relations that are either predicamental (*secundum esse*) or transcendental (*secundum dici*). If their relativity is transcendental they posit nothing real in either extreme. But according to what has been said this is false, since they really exist in the creature

as related to God. Therefore they signify predicamental relation, and consequently they posit something real in both extremes.

12. It is in the nature of relatives that given one the other follows, and if one be removed the other is also removed. If then there is a real relation in the creature, there must be in God a real relation to the creature.

On the contrary Augustine says (De Trin. v, 16): "It is clear that whatsoever is said of God relatively is an accident in the thing to which God begins to be referred." Hence it would seem that these relations are attributed to God not by reason of something in him but on account of something outside him: so that they posit nothing real in him.

Again, as the knowable thing is the measure of knowledge, so is God the measure of all things, as the Commentator says (Metaph. x). Now the knowable thing is not referred to knowledge by a real relation existing in it, but rather by the relation of knowledge to it, as the Philosopher says (Metaph. v). Therefore seemingly neither is God related to the creature by a real relation in him.

Again, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. ix): "Likeness is not reciprocal between cause and effect, for an effect is said to be like its cause and not vice versa." Now the same would seem to apply to other relations as to that of likeness. Therefore, seemingly neither is there reciprocity in the relations between God and the creature, and we cannot argue that because the creature is really related to God, therefore is God really related to the creature.

I answer that the relations whereby we refer God to creatures are not really in God. To make this clear we must observe that since a real relation consists in the order of one thing to another, as already stated, a real relation is mutual in those things alone wherein on either side there is the same reason for mutual order: and this applies to all relations consequent to quantity. For since the notion of quantity is independent of all objects of sense, it is the same in all corporeal natures. And for

the same reason that a quantitative thing A is really related to the quantitative thing B, B is really related to A. Now between one quantity, considered absolutely, and another there is the order deriving from measure and thing measured, under the name of whole and part and other such things that result from quantity.

On the other hand in relations arising from action and passion or active and passive power there is not always order of movement on both sides. Because that which has the nature of being patient, moved or caused must always have an order to the agent or mover, seeing that the effect is always perfected by its cause and dependent thereon: so that it is ordered to it as the cause of its perfection. Now agents, whether movers or causes, sometimes have an order to their respective patients, whether moved or caused, inasmuch, to wit, as the good or perfection of the mover or agent is to be found in the effect, patient or thing moved.

This is especially evident in univocal agents which by their action produce their like in species, and consequently perpetuate their species as far as this is possible. This is also evident in all other things which move, act or cause through themselves being moved; because by their very movement they are ordered to produce effects; and again in all those things where any good accrues to the cause from its effect. And there are some things to which others are ordered but not vice versa, because they are wholly foreign to that genus of actions or power from which that order arises: thus knowledge has a relation to the thing known, because the knower by an intelligible act has an order to the thing known which is outside the soul. Whereas the thing itself that is outside the soul is not touched by that act, inasmuch as the act of the intellect does not pass into exterior matter by changing it; so that the thing which is outside the soul is wholly outside the genus of intelligible things.

For this reason the relation which arises from the act of the mind cannot be in that thing. The same applies to sense and the sensible object: for although the sensible object by its own action affects the organ of sense, and consequently bears a relation to it, just as other natural agents have a relation to the things on which they act, nevertheless it is not the alteration of the organ that perfects the act of perception, but the act of the sensitive power; to which act the sensible object

outside the soul is altogether foreign. In like manner a man who stands to the right of a pillar bears a corresponding relation to the pillar by reason of his motive power whereby he is competent to be to the right or to the left, before or behind, above or below. Wherefore such-like relations in man or animal are real, but not in the thing which lacks that power. In like manner again money is external to the action whereby prices are fixed, which action is a convention between certain persons: and man is outside the genus of those actions whereby the artist produces his image. Hence there is not a real relation either in a man to his image, or in money to the price, but vice versa. Now God does not work by an intermediary action to be regarded as issuing from God and terminating in the creature: but his action is his substance and is wholly outside the genus of created being whereby the creature is related to him. Nor again does any good accrue to the creator from the production of the creature: wherefore his action is supremely liberal as Avicenna says (*Metaph. viii, 7*). It is also evident that he is not moved to act, and that without any change in himself he makes all changeable things. It follows then that there is no real relation in him to creatures, although creatures are really related to him, as effects to their cause.

In this matter Rabbi Moses erred in many ways, for he wished to prove that there is no relation between God and the creature, because seeing that God is not a body he has no relation to time or place. Thus he considered only the relation which results from quantity and not that which arises from action and passion.

Reply to the First Objection. The natural mover or agent moves and acts by an intermediary movement or action that is between the mover and the thing moved: between the agent and the patient: wherefore in this intermediary, at least agent and patient, mover and thing moved must come together. Wherefore the agent as such is not outside the genus of the patient as such: and consequently each has a real relation to the other, especially seeing that this intermediary action is a perfection proper to the agent so that the term of that action is a perfection of the agent. This does not apply to God, as stated above: and thus the comparison fails.

Reply to the Second Objection. The fact that the mover is moved is not the cause of its relation of mover being a real relation, but a sign thereof. For the fact that it

moves through being moved shows that from one point of view it belongs to the same genus as the thing moved; and again from the fact that by its movement it is moved to a certain end it follows that this end is its good.

Reply to the Third Objection. The father, being an univocal agent gives the nature of his own genus to his son: but God does not thus give being to the creature: hence the comparison fails.

Reply to the Fourth Objection. The denomination lord comprises three things in its signification: namely, first, power to compel subjects; secondly, arising from that power, relation to those subjects; thirdly, a relation in those subjects to their lord, since one relative implies the other. Accordingly the term lord retains its meaning in God as regards the first and third, but not the second. Hence Ambrose (*De Fide* i, i) says that this name lord is a name of power, and Boethius says that dominion is the power of compelling slaves.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. God's knowledge has not the same relation to things as ours has: since it is related to them as their cause and measure, inasmuch as things are true so far as by his knowledge God ordained them. On the other hand things are the cause and measure of our knowledge. Wherefore just as our knowledge bears a real relation to things and not vice versa, so are things really related to God's knowledge and not vice versa. Or we may reply that God understands other things by understanding himself, wherefore his knowledge is related directly not to things but to the divine essence.

Reply to the Sixth Objection. The appetible object that moves the appetite is the end, and the means do not move the appetite save on account of the end. Now the end of the divine will is nothing else than the divine goodness. Hence it does not follow that other things bear the same relation to the divine will as the mover does to that which it moves.

Reply to the Seventh Objection. The heavenly bodies are related to the lower bodies by real relations arising from quantity, inasmuch as on either side there is quantity of the same kind; and again by real relations arising from action and passion, because the action whereby being themselves moved they move other things is intermediary and is not their very substance, since by being a cause of lower things they obtain a certain good.

Reply to the Eighth Objection. That from which a thing is denominated need not always be its natural form, and it suffices for it to be expressed, grammatically speaking, by way of a form: thus a man is denominated from an action, his apparel and the like which are not really forms.

Reply to the Ninth Objection. If by proportion is meant a definite excess, then there is no proportion in God to the creature. But if proportion stands for relation alone, then there is relation between the Creator and the creature: in the latter really, but not in the former.

Reply to the Tenth Objection. Although the teacher begins with things, the ideas of things are received by the teacher's mind otherwise than in nature, because that which is received into another follows the mode of the recipient: and it is plain that ideas are in the teacher's mind immaterially, but materially in nature.

Reply to the Eleventh Objection. This distinction between predicamental and transcendental relatives does not prove the relations in question to be real. Certain predicamental relative terms do not signify a real relation, for instance, right and left as ascribed to a pillar: and some transcendental relative terms signify real relations, for instance, knowledge and sensation. Because relatives are said to be predicamental when terms are employed to signify the relations themselves, while they are said to be transcendental when these terms are employed to signify qualities or something of the kind primarily, from which relations arise. Nor as regards the question at issue does it matter whether they be real or logical relations.

Reply to the Twelfth Objection. Although given one relative the other follows, this does not imply that both are posited in the same way: and it suffices that one be real and the other logical.

Q. VII: ARTICLE XI

Are These Temporal Relations in God As Logical I Relations?

THE eleventh point of inquiry is whether these temporal relations are in God as logical relations: and it would seem that they are not.

[Sum. Th. I, Q. xiii, A. 7, ad i.]

1. An idea to which nothing real corresponds is idle and vain, according to Boethius (Super Proem. Poyphyr. in Praedicab.). Now these relations are not really in God, as proved above. Therefore it is vain and idle for the reason to attribute them to him.

2. That which has only a logical existence is not ascribed to things except according as they are in the mind, for instance genus, species and order. Now these temporal relations are not ascribed to God according as he is only in our mind, since if they were, then, to say that God is Lord because we understand him to reign over creatures would have no objective reality, which is clearly false. Therefore these relations are not in God as logical relations.

3. This name Lord signifies a relation since it is a predicamental relative. But Lordship is not merely a logical relation in God. Therefore neither are these relations in God only logical.

4. If there were no created intelligence God would still be Lord and Creator. But there would be no logical relations if there were no created intelligence. Therefore God and Lord and the like do not denote merely logical relations.

5. That which has existence in our mind only has not existed from eternity. Now some of God's relations to the creature have been from eternity, such as the relations implied in the terms knowledge and predestination. Therefore such are not merely logical relations in God.

On the contrary, names signify ideas or concepts (*Peri Herm. i*). Now it is plain that these names are relative terms. Therefore these relations must be logical.

I answer that just as a real relation consists in order between thing and thing, so a logical relation is the order of thought to thought; and this may occur in two ways.

First, when the order is discovered by the mind and attributed to that which is expressed in a relative term. Such are the relations attributed by the mind to the things understood as such, for instance, the relations of genus and species: for the mind discovers these relations by observing the order between that which is in the mind and that which is outside the mind, or again the order between one idea and another.

Secondly, when these relations arise from the mode of understanding, namely when the mind understands one thing in its relation to another, although that relation is not discovered by the intellect but follows by a kind of necessity its mode of understanding. Such relations are attributed by the intellect not to that which is in the intellect but to that which has objective reality. This happens forasmuch as certain things not mutually related are understood in relation to one~another, although the mind does not understand them to be related, for in that case it would be in error. Now in order that two things be related they must each have existence, be distinct from each other (for nothing bears a relation to itself), and be referable to the other. Now the mind sometimes conceives two

things as having existence, whereas one or neither of them is a being: as when it considers two futures, or one present and one future, and considers one in relation to the other by placing one before the other; wherefore such relations are purely logical since they arise from the mode of understanding. And sometimes the mind considers one thing as though it were two, and considers them in the light of a certain relationship: as when a thing is said to be identical with itself, and such a relation is purely logical. Sometimes the mind considers two things as referable to each other, whereas there is no relation between them, in fact one of them is itself essentially a relation: as when a relation is said to be accidental to its subject, wherefore such a logical relation has merely a logical relationship to anything else. Again the mind sometimes considers something in relation to another inasmuch as it is the term of the relationship of another thing to it, and yet itself is not related to the other: as when it considers something knowable as terminating the relationship of knowledge to it; and thus it imputes to the thing knowable a certain relation to knowledge, and such a relation is purely logical. In like manner our mind attributes to God certain relative terms, inasmuch as it considers God as the term of the creature's relation to him: wherefore such relations are purely logical.

Reply to the First Objection. In these relations there is something objective corresponding to them, namely the relation of the creature to God. For just as a thing is said to be knowable relatively, not in reference to knowledge but because knowledge refers to it (Metaph. v), even so God is spoken of relatively because creatures are related to him.

Reply to the Second Objection. This argument considers those relations that are discovered by reason and attributed to things that are in the mind. The relations in question, however, are not of this kind but arise from the mode of understanding.

Reply to the Third Objection. just as a man is identical with himself really and not only logically (although such a relation is merely logical) inasmuch as the cause of the relation is real, namely substantial identity, which the mind considers in the light of a relation: even so the power to compel subjects is in God really, and our mind considers it in relation to the subjects on account of the subjects' relation to God: and thus he is called Lord really, although in him the relation is merely logical.

For the same reason it is evident that he would be Lord even if there were no created mind in existence.

Hence the Reply to the Fourth Objection is clear.

Reply to the Fifth Objection. As stated above God's knowledge is related essentially not to the creature but to the essence of the Creator whereby God knows all things.